

which read, "Easily distracted by other people eating." For Sarah, the 9-month-old baby, it meant sometimes being fed Mountain Dew out of the can after she finished her formula, a dose of caffeine that kept her up at night.

Mr. Speaker, this is all taking place in rural Tennessee. That's right, Mr. Speaker. Hunger doesn't just exist in urban areas. According to USDA statistics, rural areas are poorer than urban areas. And according to the latest USDA data, households in rural areas were more likely to be food insecure. While 14.9 percent of all households were food insecure in 2011, 15.4 percent of households in rural areas were food insecure.

And let's look at the SNAP statistics. While 16 percent of all Americans live in nonmetropolitan areas, 21 percent of SNAP beneficiaries live there. Ten percent of the rural population relies on SNAP, compared to 7 percent of the urban population. Children under 18 make up 25 percent of the rural population, but they are 40 percent of the rural population using SNAP.

These statistics show empirically that hunger is a problem in rural America. Sunday's article paints a terrible and disturbing picture about hunger in rural America. And together, they show why we must commit ourselves to end hunger now.

That's why it is so disturbing to me that so many of my Republican friends seem hell-bent on cutting huge amounts from the SNAP program, literally throwing millions of Americans off the program. It shows a stunning ignorance of current reality, and it shows a callousness that, quite frankly, is beneath this institution.

During the recent debate on the farm bill, I had heard a number of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle demean the poor in this country and diminish their struggle. I heard rhetoric from some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle characterizing these Americans who are struggling in poverty in inappropriate and demeaning ways. It was offensive, some of the rhetoric that was spouted here on this floor.

I urge all of my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans alike, to reject any assault on the SNAP program.

Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity to end hunger now, but we must take it. We need some leadership. We need leadership in this House, but we also need leadership from the White House in order to get this done. We need the White House to host a conference on food and nutrition. We need the President to bring the best and brightest minds from any and every corner of this Nation together, lock them in a room, and direct them to come up with a plan. It is not hard.

We need the political will to end hunger now. This issue needs to be more of a priority.

## **RISING STUDENT LOAN INTEREST RATES**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon, Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID stated, "If we do nothing, student loan rates go to 6.8 percent," as reported by Politico.

In case the Leader forgot, interest rates doubled to 6.8 percent last week. The House acted to prevent it. The Senate did not.

Today, The Washington Post Editorial Board writes:

The Senate is set to consider on Wednesday the Keep Student Loans Affordable Act in what could be the Chamber's only reaction to the recent doubling of a low student loan interest rate . . . lawmakers should reject this pathetic nonresolution.

The editorial continues:

With the President and the House in near alignment on the student loan issue, the Senate has no excuse to fail. Mr. Obama should press Democrats hard and work with Republicans to strike a deal, not to vote for dead-end policy.

Unfortunately, rather than solve problems, the Senate is wasting the American people's time and moving forward with another dead-end policy, what today's Post refers to as another "campaign gimmick."

The people deserve better. Our students deserve better in this country.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate has no excuse.

## **IT'S TIME TO CHANGE THE NAME OF THE NATIONAL FOOTBALL LEAGUE'S WASHINGTON FOOTBALL FRANCHISE**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, it's time that the National Football League and the NFL Commissioner Roger Goodell face the reality that the continued use of the word "redskin" is unacceptable. It is a racist, derogatory term and patently offensive to Native Americans.

The Native American community has spent millions of dollars over the past two decades trying earnestly to fight the racism that is perpetuated by this slur.

□ 1030

The fact that the NFL and Commissioner Goodell continue to deny this is a shameful testament of the mistreatment of Native Americans for so many years. It is quite obvious that once the American public understands why the word "redskins" is so offensive, they'll know that the word should never be used again.

The origin of the term "redskins" is commonly attributed to the historical practice of trading Native American

Indian scalps and body parts as bounties and trophies. For example, in 1749, the British bounty on the Mi'kmaq Nation of what is now Maine and Nova Scotia was a straightforward "10 Guineas for every Indian Mi'kmaq taken or killed, to be paid upon producing such savage taken or his scalp."

Just as devastating was the Phips Proclamation, issued in 1755 by Spencer Phips, lieutenant governor and commander in chief of the Massachusetts Bay Province, who called for the wholesale extermination of the Penobscot Indian Nation. By vote of the General Court of the Province, settlers were paid out of the public treasury for killing and scalping the Penobscot people. The bounty for a male Penobscot Indian above the age of 12 years was 50 pounds, and his scalp was worth 40 pounds. The bounty for a female Penobscot Indian of any age and for the males under the age of 12 was 25 pounds, while their scalps were worth 20 pounds. These scalps, Mr. Speaker, were called "redskins."

The question is quite simple. Suppose that that redskin scalp that was bought for payment was the scalp of your mother, the scalp of your wife, the scalp of your daughter, the scalp of your father, the scalp of your husband, or of your son. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, Native Americans are human beings, not animals.

The current chairman and chief of the Penobscot Nation, Chief Kirk Francis, recently declared in a joint statement that "redskins" is "not just a racial slur or derogatory term" but a painful "reminder of one of the most gruesome acts of ethnic cleansing ever committed against the Penobscot people." The hunting and killing of Penobscot Indians, as stated by Chief Francis, was "a most despicable and disgraceful act of genocide."

Recently, myself and nine Members of Congress explained the violent history and disparaging nature of the term "redskins" in a letter to Mr. Dan Snyder, owner of the Washington football franchise. Similar letters were sent to Mr. Frederick Smith, president and CEO of FedEx, a key sponsor of the franchise, and Mr. Roger Goodell, commissioner of the National Football League. As of today, Mr. Snyder has not yet responded. Mr. Smith ignored our letter as well, opting instead to have a staff member cite contractual obligations as FedEx's reason for its silence on the subject.

Mr. Goodell, however, in a dismissive manner, declared that the team's name "is a unifying force that stands for strength, courage, pride, and respect." Give me a break, Mr. Speaker. In other words, the National Football League is telling everyone—Native Americans included—that they cannot be offended because the NFL means no offense. Essentially, Mr. Goodell attempts to wash away the stain from a history of persecution against Native American people by spreading twisted and false information concerning the use of the